

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/614,839	07/08/2003	John M. Harris	CE10879R	CE10879R 9161	
22917 MOTOROLA,	7590 03/07/2007 INC		EXAMINER		
1303 EAST A	LGONQUIN ROAD	REGO, DOMINIC E			
IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2618		
		,	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/07/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com APT099@motorola.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/614,839	HARRIS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Dominic E. Rego	2618		

	Dominic E. Rego	2618					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.				
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origited than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed an	diance with 27 CEP 41 27 must be	filed within two month	s of the data of				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AMENDMENTS	had a da sha dha a daha af fillian a ladaf	20					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further combined (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below). 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,13-19,23-36,38 and 39.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
•							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, applicants argues that Rosen does not teach or suggest assigning a traffic channel of an MS that is likely to be a target of communication that has not yet been initiated. The examiner disagrees. First of all, examiner could not find in claim 1 by stating "assigning a traffic channel of an MS that is likely to be a target of communication that has not yet been initiated. Claim 1 only states that "assigning a traffic channel to the MS to avoid pagingrelated delays for the MS should the MS become a target of communication". So both statements are not same. Further, claim 1, line 5, applicants state " performing at least one of: ", so examiner selects the second part "signaling the MS to transition to at least one operation mode in which paging-related delays for the MS are reduced" and in response to argument would be based on everything in independent claim 1, except for "when a loading level of a serving cell of the MS is below an assignment threshold, assigning a traffic channel to the MS to avoid paging-related delays for the MS should the MS become a target of communication". Rosen, paragraph 0089, states "In one embodiment, where a shorter apparent latency is desired, the talker may be allowed to begin speaking before even his traffic channel is re-established. Because the client MS is not yet in communication with the CM, the signal to the talker to begin talking is made by the client MS. If the talker is allowed to speak before the talker's traffic channel is re-established, the client MS may buffer the speech. Because communication with the CM has not yet been established, permission to talk is being given "optimistically which is equivelent to "anticipating by a radio access network (RAN) that an MS is likely to be a target of communication not yet initiated". Applicants further argues that Drucker does not teach "signaling the MS to transition to at least one operational mode in which pagingrelated delays for the MS are reduced". The examiner disagrees. In lines 44-67, Drucker teaches the present invention provides a system that reduces paging frame delays when more than one page assigned to a single paging slot is to be sent in a given frame. The paging system of the present invention transmits pages for mobile units, which are assigned to the same paging slot, seguentially within a frame beginning with the assigned paging slot. In conjunction, each mobile unit is controlled to remain in an ON mode beginning with its assigned paging slot until a page for that mobile unit or an empty paging slot is recognized. Thus, if no page is recognized when the mobile unit is on, it is switched to an OFF mode (transition at least one operational mode in which paging-related delays for the MS are reduced) to conserve energy during the remainder of the frame period.

DR

NAY MAUNG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER